

Claim 144: The composition of claim 143, wherein said expression vector encodes a plurality of peptides.

Claim 145: A composition useful in treating a subject afflicted with a cancer, comprising the recombinant cell of claim 125, and a pharmaceutically acceptable adjuvant.

D/V
Claim 146: The composition of claim 145, wherein said recombinant cell expresses an HLA or MHC molecule.

Claim 147: The composition of claim 145, wherein said recombinant cell is a recombinant human cell.

REMARKS

The amendment is presented in accordance with 37 CFR § 1.121(h). Claims were cancelled and added, so no showing of changes is required.

Claims 54-73 are cancelled, so all issues surrounding these are moot. Non-elected claims 74-79 and 85-107 are cancelled.

Claims 80-84 are replaced by claims 143-147. They are identical to claim 80-84 but for dependency changes. The claims are discussed below.

Claims 108, 129 and 130 have been rejected because the "CRF submitted February 26, 2002 was found to be damaged." The examiner refers to an allegedly attached CRF problem report.

There was no attachment to the office action. Further, the applicants do not see why they are responsible if the mails or the USPTO damaged the sequence disk. Nor do they understand why the PTO delayed for over 4 months before advising of the damage.

Given that there was nothing attached to the office action, it will be appreciated that the last sentence of point 6 of the action cannot be addressed. Further, since applicants have nothing to refer to vis a vis errors, if the submission is deemed insufficient, a holding of abandonment would be inappropriate.

Turning to new claims 143-147 (former claims 80-84), first of all it is pointed out that the examiner is mistaken in stating that "claims 80 and 84 are drawn to compositions comprising expression vectors . . ." Claims 80 & 81 were so drawn, and claims 143 & 144 are as well.

Claims 82-84 were drawn to compositions containing recombinant cells. So, too, are claims 145-147.

The examiner argues, essentially, that there is no discussion of what regions within the proteins of SEQ ID NOS: 5-8 would constitute an epitope, and that the reference to Paul teaches that finding one is not a trivial matter.

In response, applicants note the following. With respect to HLA or MHC binding, the field is replete with teachings of binding motifs for HLA and MHC molecules. For example, one may refer, e.g., to Marsh, The HLA FactsBook (Academic Press, 2000), for teachings of dozens of binding motifs for various HLA molecules. A random sample of such teachings are attached, as submitting the entire work is believed to be overkill.

The Paul reference relates to the fine structure of the epitopes, but not to identifying them. As is pointed out herein, all one needs is a sequence and a guide, such as Marsh, to ascertain which peptides would be relevant.

No arguments were presented against the subject matter of claims 82-84, so no response is necessary, other than to reiterate that the arguments made supra apply to these claims as well.

In view of the foregoing, allowance of claims 108, 110-128 and 139-147 is believed proper and is urged. Claims 110-128 and 131-142 were allowed previously, so only claims 108, 129, 130 and 143-147 should be at issue.

Respectfully submitted,

FULBRIGHT & JAWORSKI, L.L.P.



Norman D. Hanson, Esq.
Registration No. 30,946